



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

BRACHER RAWLINS LLP
Fox Court
14 Gray's Inn Road
London WC1X 8HN

COPY MAILED

JUL 11 2008

Enclosure: February 13, 2008 letter, requesting registration of a "Freezing Injunction"

For: U.S. Patent Nos. 6,818,033;	:	
6,849,094; 6,936,095; 7,207,197 and 7,300,482; and	:	DECISION
U.S. Patent Application Publication Nos. 2003/0159412;	:	DISMISSING
2004/0103785; 2004/0083773; 2004/0244438;	:	REQUEST
2005/0092032; 2005/0194295 and 2006/0162299	:	

This is a decision on the letter, dated February 13, 2008, requesting registration of a "Freezing Injunction," issued In The High Court of Justice, Chancery Division, against (a) U.S. Patent Nos. 6,818,033, 6,849,094, 6,936,095, 7,207,197, 7,300,482, any other U.S. patents for which John Herbert North is the applicant, and (b) U.S. Patent Application Publication Nos. 2003/0159412, 2004/0103785, 2004/0083773, 2004/0244438, 2005/0092032, 2005/0194295 and 2006/0162299. The letter is taken as written requests for both (a) a citation of information under 35 U.S.C. § 301 in multiple patents, and (b) a citation of information under 35 U.S.C. § 122(b) in multiple published patent applications.

This request is before the Office of Patent Legal Administration for decision.

The present request for citation of the Freezing Injunction in the above-captioned U.S. patents and patent application publications has been fully considered. The request is dismissed, for the reasons set forth below.

RELEVANT STATUTES, REGULATIONS, AND EXAMINING PROCEDURE

37 CFR 1.4(c) provides:

"Since different matters may be considered by different branches or sections of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, each distinct subject, inquiry or order must

be contained in a separate paper to avoid confusion and delay in answering papers dealing with different subjects."

35 U.S.C. § 122(b) provides:

(c) PROTEST AND PRE-ISSUANCE OPPOSITION.— The Director shall establish appropriate procedures to ensure that no protest or other form of pre-issuance opposition to the grant of a patent on an application may be initiated after publication of the application without the express written consent of the applicant.

The Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) § 1134 provides (in part):

Any submission filed by a third party (e.g., a protest) in an application published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b) (without the express written consent of the applicant) that does not comply with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.99 will be disregarded and not entered into the application file.

35 U.S.C. § 301 provides:

Any person at any time may cite to the Office in writing prior art consisting of patents or printed publications which that person believes to have a bearing on the patentability of any claim of a particular patent. If the person explains in writing the pertinency and manner of applying such prior art to at least one claim of the patent, the citation of such prior art and the explanation thereof will become a part of the official file of the patent. At the written request of the person citing the prior art, his or her identity will be excluded from the patent file and kept confidential.

The Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) § 2205 provides (in part):

The prior art which may be submitted under 35 U.S.C. 301 is limited to "written prior art consisting of patents or printed publications."

If the prior art citation contains any issue not directed to patents and printed publications, it should not be entered into the patent file, despite the fact that it may otherwise contain a complete submission of patents and printed publications with an explanation of the pertinency and applicability. Rather, the prior art citation should be returned to the sender as described in MPEP § 2206.

DISCUSSION

The instant written request for citation of the Freezing Injunction is improper, because 37 CFR 1.4(c) provides that "each distinct subject, inquiry or order must be contained in a separate paper to avoid confusion and delay in answering papers dealing with different subjects." In

this instance, a third party has provided written requests for both (a) a citation of information under 35 U.S.C. § 301 in a patent, and (b) a citation of information under 35 U.S.C. § 122(b) in a published patent application. Accordingly, the request is improper, and is dismissed.

It is additionally noted as follows:

1. The request for "any other U.S. patents for which John Herbert North is the applicant" is indefinite and does not identify a specific patent to which the request may be applied. Further, 37 CFR 1.4(b) requires that "a separate copy of every paper to be filed in a patent, patent file, or other proceeding must be furnished for each file to which the paper pertains, even though the contents of the papers filed in two or more files may be identical," and requestor clearly has not provided copies for all the above-captioned patents, published patent applications, and any other patents for which John Herbert North is the applicant.
2. The prior art which may be submitted under 35 U.S.C. § 301 is limited to patents or printed publications. The present information citation (submission) contains an issue not directed to patents and printed publications, as well as comments on the information submitted. Requester has not shown the present information submission to be compliant with 35 U.S.C. § 301 and MPEP 2205.
3. Any submission filed by a third party (e.g., a protest) in an application published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b) (without the express written consent of the applicant) must comply with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.99. Requester has not shown the present information submission to be compliant with 35 U.S.C. § 122(b) and MPEP 1134.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, the written request under 35 U.S.C. § 301 and 35 U.S.C. § 122(b) for citation of prior art is dismissed

The citation (submission) of information will not be entered into any file, and it is returned herewith to the sender.

Any questions concerning this communication should be directed to Nicole D. Dretar, Legal Advisor, at 571-272-7717.



Kenneth M. Schor
Senior Legal Advisor
Office of Patent Legal Administration

June 24, 2008